

**Minutes of Land Use, Parks and Environment Committee**  
**Tuesday, September 16, 2008**

Vice-Chair Kolb called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. and led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Committee Present:** Supervisors James Jeskewitz, Walter Kolb, Robert Hutton, Ted Rolfs, and Gilbert Yerke. **Absent:** Supervisors Fritz Ruf (Chair) and Janel Brandtjen.

**Also Present:** Chief of Staff Mark Mader, Legislative Associate Karen Phillips, Planning and Zoning Manager Dick Mace, Parks and Land Use Director Dale Shaver, Budget Management Specialist Linda Witkowski, Senior Financial Analyst Bill Duckwitz, Business Manager Peter Mudek, and Parks System Manager Duane Grimm.

**Approve Minutes of August 19, 2008**

MOTION: Jeskewitz moved, second by Yerke, to approve the minutes of August 19, 2008, as corrected. Motion carried: 5-0.

**Correspondence**

1. Letter from David I. Maurstad, Assistant Administrator of FEMA, to Jim Dwyer regarding floodplain management.
2. Letter from Richard E. Steffes, DNR real estate director, to Jim Dwyer regarding purchase of 970 acres of land for the Kettle Moraine State Forest – Southern Unit.

**Executive Committee Report**

Mader reported on the review of the Capital Plan Projects from the Executive Committee meeting on September 15, 2008.

Yerke asked for approval to attend the Lake Management District Training. Mader stated he would check further regarding his request.

**Future Meeting Dates**

- October 7, 2008
- October 21, 2008

Mace encouraged the committee members to attend the Public Hearing on September 24 regarding the Floodplain Amendments.

**Discuss and Consider Ordinance 163-O-33: Amend The Text Of The Town Of Mukwonago Zoning Code By Repealing And Recreating Section 82-269(A) Regarding Revisions To The Forfeiture Schedule For Violations (ZT-1677)**

Mace explained this is an amendment to change the forfeiture schedule for violations under the Town of Mukwonago Zoning Ordinance. The maximum would increase from \$200.00 to \$2,000.00 per day for each violation. The minimum amount of \$10.00 per day remains.

MOTION: Rolfs moved, second by Jeskewitz, to approve Ordinance 163-O-033. Motion carried 5-0.

**Discuss and Consider Ordinance 163-O-34: Amend The Town Of Geneseo District Zoning Map Of The Waukesha County Zoning Code For The Town Of Geneseo By Conditionally Rezoning Certain Lands Located In Part Of The SW ¼ Of Section 30, T6N, R18E, Town Of Geneseo, From The A-P Agricultural Land Preservation District To The A-2 Rural Home District (CZ-1673)**

Mace explained the location of the 8-acre northern parcel and the 28-acre southern parcel. He stated the Staff recommendation is approval of the change. The owner is proposing to sell the northerly parcel. Mace explained one of the conditions is that the northerly parcel cannot be divided any further. He stated the topography is mostly a rugged terrain. One concern was the location of the residential driveway access point

with respect to safety. Upon inspection with the assistance of the Highway Department, it was determined it was acceptable providing they use the north fork of the access point, as Mace pointed out on a map.

MOTION: Yerke moved, second by Hutton, to approve Ordinance 163-O-034. Motion carried 5-0.

**Discuss and Consider Ordinance 163-O-35: Amend The District Zoning Map Of The Town Of Waukesha Zoning Ordinance By Amending Exhibit "A", Paragraph "A" Of The Town Of Waukesha Zoning Code To Revise The Specific Location Of A Shared Driveway On A Common Boundary Line, For Certain Lands Located In The NW ¼ Of Section 15, T6N, R19E, Town Of Waukesha (ZT-1237E)**

Mace explained the location of the property, consisting of three parcels, located on the southeast corner of Sunset Drive and S. Prairie Ave., containing approximately 2 acres. He explained the Staff recommendation for approval in that it would accommodate the direct access to Sunset Drive for the two parcels without having to rely on the access through the third parcel. The result would be the removal of two separate driveway openings and the recreation of one wider driveway to serve the two parcels.

MOTION: Jeskewitz moved, second by Yerke, to approve Ordinance 163-O-035. Motion carried 5-0.

**Review and Consider Capital Projects in the Proposed 2009-2013 Plan for which the Committee has Budget and Policy Oversight:**

Shaver acknowledged Chair Ruf's son, John Ruf, on his bronze medal win while competing in the sailing competition of the Paralympics Games in China.

Shaver stated that most of the Capital Projects this year are a continuation of the existing schedules with no change.

Parks and Land Use (Items 38-45)

Item 38: Orthophotography – Shaver stated this is a continuation of an existing project. A project is done every five years, working with SEWRPC, to have the new Orthophotography prepared for the County when it is done for their region. The projection also includes a Digital Terrain Model (DTM) to provide topographic information at a two-foot contour level throughout the County. Shaver explained the scope change to the revenues. The previous revenue composition was that all of the \$800,000 was to be covered by retained fees out of the Land Information Program. A change is proposed, because of the fund balance in the retained fees for the GIS Program, that \$600,000 come from the retained Land Information fees and \$200,000 come from the Capital Project fund balance.

Mader asked Shaver to give one or two examples why this project is needed, in case this question is raised on the Board floor. Shaver stated the site is used extensively to gather data for pending projects, site work, etc. Prospective buyers of properties, property owners, Real Estate Companies and Engineering firms rely on the most recent orthophotos. There are often requests for updates to be done more often than every five years. Shaver stated this information has become invaluable to the Parks and Land Use Department for their projects.

Item 39: Menomonee Park Maintenance Building – This project is as planned. The current building is an old military building from the early 1950's. The building would be abandoned and replaced with their standard maintenance building design. Shaver pointed out that the project does not include the removal of the existing building. They would come back with a more formal project after further study is done, including the asbestos removal. They need to confirm information from the military that the building can be removed.

Item 40: Exposition Center Arena Roof – Shaver explained that in 2007 a roofing specialist analyzed and gave recommendations for the Expo Center buildings. The study identified deficiencies and concluded that the Arena roof was nearing the end of its service life. There were three alternatives identified, which ranged in cost from \$300,000-\$595,000. The Capital Project was budgeted at about mid range (\$435,000), and they will use \$25,000 in 2009 to get a second opinion on the roof structure.

Item 41: Fox Brook Park Reserved Picnic Shelter 2 – Shaver explained the reasoning for deletion of this project. He stated the second shelter had been included as a future phase of the plan for the development of Fox Brook Park. Staff has looked at alternatives for placement of the shelter, but did not find a suitable location for a variety of reasons. To put in another shelter would require another parking lot and take away green space. There are other picnic shelters available at other County Parks.

Item 42: Pavement Management Plan – Shaver provided a cost update, proposing to increase the expenditure budget from \$400,000 to \$460,000. He stated that historically they have done concrete work (sidewalks, curbing) within their operating budget, and that is becoming increasingly difficult. Jeskewitz asked if some of the projects could be moved up, due to the current state of the market and lower prices. Shaver stated yes, they do accelerate projects when the prices are favorable.

Item 43: Bikeway Pavement Improvements – Shaver explained the project plan includes the paving of the New Berlin, Lake County and Bugline Trails. The New Berlin Trail was completed at significant cost savings because bases were in better condition and the site prep work was not required, resulting in the project coming in under budget. Shaver said that State Stewardship funds, (a 50/50 grant program) would be pursued for the next project, the Lake County Trail. If the grant funding is received in 2009, the Lake County Trail would be done in 2010. Jeskewitz asked when the Bugline Trail would be paved. Shaver stated the grant funding would be pursued in 2009, with construction to begin in 2011.

Item 44: Retzer Nature Center Maintenance Building – Shaver explained they are looking at more sustainable initiatives for their buildings. Staff has worked with WE Energies about having a solar window analyzed for the site. They have also analyzed a geothermal system and the use of wind as a source of energy. They are proposing to increase the cost of the project \$ 17,000 (after grants received from WE Energies). They would use the solar system for hot water and a geothermal system to heat the building. The payback for the solar system is anticipated within 13 years. After the payback period, the system will generate an electricity credit for excess energy produced. The payback for the geothermal should be achieved within 5-7 years.

Hutton questioned the project cost of \$800,000 for a 3300 square foot maintenance shed. He asked for more detail of the cost breakdowns. Shaver explained there are many factors that the County must abide by as opposed to a non-government construction project. Some of the issues include prevailing wage rates for construction (10-20% increase to the cost of the project), and performance labor material bonding (2% added on). Shaver stated the project includes lighting, driveway, landscaping – the total package. Shaver added that also included is the aggravation and general conditions factor, which means that they have to budget 5-10% more on their projects because of additional documentation needed on municipal funded projects.

Item 45: Restroom Renovation – Shaver explained the change in scope for the staff to spend time looking at sustainability options such as solar heating and lighting, and lower cost alternatives to the current design that would still meet the architectural standards of the communities.

Hutton clarified that the cost would be \$3 million for 18 bathrooms, for an average of about \$167,000 per bathroom. He expressed his concern at the high cost of this project. Grimm explained the cost documentation as listed includes soil testing, mound systems, wells, and site work; the restroom itself is about \$98,000. Hutton asked if they looked at outsourcing the restroom needs to an outside firm to supply and maintain port-a-potty units on an annual basis. Shaver stated that there would not be much difference between that and what we have now. Further discussion followed regarding possibility of increasing the scheduled maintenance intervals of the current toilets to improve the unpleasant conditions. Grimm explained there is also the hand washing issue. The new buildings would also provide sinks.

Mader asked if the Committee or Hutton would like him to convey any concerns over the project to the Executive Committee. Hutton stated that is not necessary; he would not be supporting this project regardless.

Yerke stated he has concerns with the cost, asking if the pumping of the tanks could be done more often. Grimm explained it is very expensive to do that.

Rolfs asked if people really expect better bathroom facilities in the parks. Shaver stated the feedback from their customers indicate bathrooms are a high priority. Mader added that according to previous surveys of parks users, the users indicated they were not happy with the bathrooms facilities provided. The previous parks manager, sensitive to those concerns, worked on getting this project into the Capital Projects Plan. Grimm explained that when a reservation at Fox Brook Park (with modern bathrooms) is not available, people question what the bathroom facilities are like at the other County parks. It is an important factor, and it will make or break people utilizing the other park pavilions and shelters. Kolb asked if the cost varies from park to park for rentals of pavilions and shelters. Grimm explained the costs are the same for all the parks. Hutton clarified that the camping facilities are not included in this project. Shaver stated the demand from their customers was for the facilities in the Parks picnic areas; as the Parks System changes, the level of expectation has evolved.

#### County-Wide Projects (Items 50-51)

Item 50: Asset Management Conversion – Deleted and combined with Item 51.

Item 51: Asset Management System - Grimm stated this project is shared with Public Works. It is designed to take all the facilities, catalog them and set up maintenance programs for the facilities on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis, as well as replacement programs. Grimm explained that IT knows of two companies that can incorporate the Public Works linear assets and facilities with the needs of Parks and Land Use. An RFP would be conducted to find the best Asset Management system to incorporate all of their needs in one program.

#### **Meeting Approval**

After further checking, Mader informed the Committee that a motion for approval to attend the Lake Management District Training would be in order.

MOTION: Yerke moved, second by Jeskewitz, to approve attendance of the Lake Management District Training on September 17, 2008. Motion carried: 5-0.

MOTION: Rolfs moved, second by Jeskewitz, to adjourn the meeting at 10:26 a.m. Motion carried 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Jeskewitz  
Secretary